IAPR 2 7 1954

COLUDENTIAL

MEDIORARDUM FOR: Chief, Regulations Control Staff, DD/A

SUBJECT:

Proposed Agency Regulation

LEAVE

25X1A

This office concurs for the Deputy Director (Plans) in the revised draft, dated 5 April 1954, of the above proposed regulation, subject to the following:

1. The application of the regulation should be clarified since the former paragraph on "Staff Agents and has been deleted."

25X1C

- 2. Since this is a Headquarters regulation, it is believed preferable that any material which is applicable only to the Field be deleted. In our opinion, this would include:
- a. The last three sentences of paragraph 1.a, referring to the application of the principles of the regulation in administering the leave of native and foreign national contract employees at overseas installations.
- b. Delegation and assignment of authority to Senior Representatives, Mission and Station Chiefs, in paragraph 2.a(1).
 - 3. The words, "As a general practice", beginning the second sentence of paragraph 1.d(1), should be deleted and this sentence should state that the Office of the Comptroller will furnish leave balances to employees at least once a year.
 - 4. We do not see the need for the requirement in paragraph 2.a(2) that a written delegation of authority to specific positions or to individuals by name should be made by Area Divisions and Senior Staff Chiefs, with copies to Personnel and the Comptroller. An appropriate CS Instruction on "Leave", copies of which could be made available to these two offices, would seem sufficient.

THE !

- 5. The last sentence of paragraph 3.f.(1) should be changed. Because of unforeseen circumstances, it will sometimes happen that a SF-71 has not been prepared and the employee is not present to initial the T&A report. In such cases a certification, by the T&A clerk or the approving official as appropriate under the circumstances, either on or accompanying the T&A report, should be satisfactory. Processing of the employee's check should not be delayed.
- 6. It might be desirable to include a brief mention in paragraph 3.1.(2) of the T&A reporting of advance annual leave.
- 7. The third sentence of paragraph h.c. may give the impression that the required certification regarding sick leave is in addition to initialing of the T&A by the employee, and so might result in confusion in completion and submission of the T&A report.
- 8. If the SF-71 submitted to the Medical Office by the employee to report more than 3 days sick leave does not require the signature of the approving official, paragraph h.e. should so state.
- 9. The last sentence of paragraph 4.e.(1) is not clear to us.
- 10. It is believed that paragraph h.f.(1) should read, "In case of serious disability or ailment, or when required by the exigencies of the situation,", since a person may not be seriously ill or disabled, yet advance sick leave would be justified.
- Il. Regarding paragraph 5.b.(1), it is believed that emergency annual or sick leave, even though spent in the U.S., provided travel is at the employee's own expense, should not cause an extension of the tour of duty. Emergency LWOP, of course, would cause an extension.
- 12. Neither do we believe that IWOP granted to an overseas employee, if used abroad, even though for his personal convenience,
 up to the number of days annual leave the employee would be entitled
 to, should extend the tour of duty. This seems only fair, at least

The second of th

p. Miliula.

in those cases where employees must take LMCP, or otherwise forego leave, in order to accumulate sufficient annual leave for home leave purposes at the end of their tour of duty.

- 13. The second sentence of paragraph 6.c(1) does not seem to belong to this paragraph and should be made part of paragraph 6.c(2).
- 14. In the third sentence of paragraph 7.c the precise meaning of "security and organizational information" is not clear. Moreover, if this procedure pertains only to overseas personnel, as seems possible, it should be deleted entirely.
- 15. Regarding paragraph 10.a(2), even though we have requested above that delegations of authority to the Field should be deleted from this regulation, it seems appropriate to note that DD/P does not concur in the approval of LMCP beyond 30 days by Field officials. In this connection, present AFR 30-2 requires amendment, since it authorizes Field officials to approve LMCP up to 12 months.
- 16. Regarding approval of LMCP at Headquarters, it is believed that any approval beyond 30 days should go through the appropriate Career Service Board, and that the regulation should so state.
- 17. With further reference to the approval of LMCP, it is believed that a SF-52 should be forwarded to the Office of Personnel only if the LMCP is for more than 30 days. Paragraph 10.d of the present draft requires this for any period of 14 calendar days or more.

25X1A

FOR THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR (PLANS):

